<center>**Remarks**</center>

1.   Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed February 7, 2008, (i) the Examiner objected to claims 46-50 because the claims included quotation marks and because the claims did not end with a period, (ii) the Examiner indicated that claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 38, 39, 44, 45, and 51 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,703 (Papineau), (iii) the Examiner objected to claims 9-12, 44-45, and 51 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and (iv) the Examiner indicated that claims 14, 19-22, 28, 40, 41, 43, 52, 53, 55, and 56 are allowable.

On the office action summary sheet, the Examiner indicated that claim 54 is rejected. However, in the office action, the Examiner did not indicate any grounds upon which claim 54 is rejected.

2.   Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has cancelled claim 1 and amended claims 6, 9-14, 19, 20, 22, 38, 44-52, and 54. Claims 6, 9-14, 19-22, 28, 38-41, and 43-56 are currently pending. Of the pending claims, 9, 10, 12, 14, 28, 44, 45, and 51 are independent.

Applicant has amended claims 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20, 22, 44, 45, 51, 52, and 54 to remove the word "Java" from the phrases "Java MIDlet" and "Java MIDlet application, although Applicant does not intend to give up coverage for embodiments in which the claimed MIDlet is a Java MIDlet or in which the claimed MIDlet application is a Java MIDlet application.

3.   Response to Claim Objections and Claim Rejections

The Examiner objected to claims 46-50 because each of these claims included quotation marks and did not end with a period. The Examiner indicated that the quotation marks are

<center>- 13 -</center>

unnecessary and should be removed for clarity. The Examiner suggested that Applicant remove the quotation marks and put a period at the end of each claim. Applicant has amended claims 46-50 so that the claims do not include quotation marks and so that the claims end with a period. Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 46-50 overcome the Examiner's objections to these claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 46-50.

Next, the Examiner indicated that claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 38, 39, 44, 45, and 51 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Papineau. Additionally, the Examiner objected to claims 9-12, 44-45, and 51 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has cancelled claim 1, and thus the rejection of claim 1 is moot. Additionally, Applicant has rewritten claims 9, 10, 12, 44, 45, and 51 in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 except that each occurrence of the phrase "first Java MIDlet" in claim 1 was replaced with the phrase "first MIDlet" and each occurrence of the phrase "second Java MIDlet" in claim 1 was replaced with the phrase "second MIDlet."

Claim 9, as amended, is patentably distinct from Papineau for at least the reason that claim 9 recites and the claims of Papineau do not recite prior to passing the appended second data and the URI that identifies the first MIDlet application to a second MIDlet application on the mobile information device: (i) determining based on a scheme of the second URI that the second MIDlet application is registered to handle the second URI, and (ii) invoking the second MIDlet application.

- 14 -

Claim 10, as amended, is patentably distinct from Papineau for at least the reason that claim 10 recites and the claims of Papineau do not recite prior to passing the appended second data and the URI that identifies the first MIDlet application to a second MIDlet application on the mobile information device: (i) determining based on a scheme of the second URI and based on additional scheme specific information of the second URI that the second MIDlet application is registered to handle the second URI, and (ii) invoking the second MIDlet application.

Claim 12, as amended, is patentably distinct from Papineau for at least the reason that claim 12 recites and the claims of Papineau do not recite wherein the appended second data passed to the second MIDlet application allows execution control to be returned to a previous context used before the second MIDlet application was invoked.

Claim 44, as amended, is patentably distinct from Papineau for at least the reason that claim 44 recites and the claims of Papineau do not recite wherein the first MIDlet application and the second MIDlet application are in a MIDlet suite on the mobile information device.

Claim 45, as amended, is patentably distinct from Papineau for at least the reason that claim 45 recites and the claims of Papineau do not recite wherein the first MIDlet application is in a first MIDlet suite on the mobile information device and the second MIDlet application is in a second MIDlet suite on the mobile information device.

Claim 51, as amended, is patentably distinct from Papineau for at least the reason that claim 51 recites and the claims of Papineau do not recite wherein passing the appended second data and the URI that identifies the first MIDlet application from the application management system to the second MIDlet application is carried out in response to the second MIDlet application sending a request to the application management system.

- 15 -

Applicant submits that claims 9, 10, 12, 44, 45, and 51 are now in a condition for allowance. Applicant has amended claims 6, 13, and 38 such that each of claims 6, 13, 38, and 39 all depend from independent claim 9. Since claims 6, 11, 13, 38, 39, 46-50, and 54 depend from one of allowable claims 9, 10, and 51, Applicant submits that claims 6, 11, 13, 38, 39, 46-50, and 54 are allowable as well.

4.   Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 14, 19-22, 28, 40, 41, 43, 52, 53, 55, and 56 are allowable. Of these claims, claim 28 is independent and claims 43, 53, and 56 depend from claim 28. Claims 28, 43, 53, and 56 are not amended in this paper. Applicant submits that claims 28, 43, 53, and 56 remain in a condition for allowance.

Additionally, Applicant has amended claims 14, 19, 20, 22, and 52 by deleting each occurrence of the word "Java." Claim 14 is independent and claims 19-22, 40, 41, 52, and 55 depend from claim 14. At a minimum, the prior art of record does not reasonably lead to passing the appended second data and the URI that identifies the MIDlet application from the application management system to a non-MIDlet application on the mobile information device, as recited in claim 14. Applicant submits that claims 14, 19-22, 40, 41, 52, and 55 remain in a condition for allowance.

5.   Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

- 16 -

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 6, 9-14, 19-22, 28, 38-41, and 43-56 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: May 6, 2008

By:_____/David L. Ciesielski/_____

David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432